

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JANIS STACY	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 10-4693
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
LSI CORPORATION, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **22nd** day of **June, 2011**, upon consideration of the parties' request for a stipulated discovery confidentiality order (doc. no. 35), it is hereby **ORDERED** that the request is **DENIED**.¹

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Eduardo C. Robreno

EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

1. The proposed stipulated protective order of confidentiality fails to meet the good cause requirements set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). Specifically, the parties must identify, individually or by category of documents, which documents will be marked confidential and, as to each document or set of documents, explain why the documents should be so designated. The parties may resubmit a stipulation of confidentiality that adheres closely to the principles set forth by the Third Circuit in Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg, 23 F.3d 772 (3d Cir. 1994). See, e.g., Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. George Hyman Constr. Co., 155 F.R.D. 113 (E.D. Pa. 1994) (applying requirements of Pansy to request for confidentiality order).